

been used as woodworking tools.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, a large production of blanks seems, above all, to be obtained only by a stone processing system, even numerous wooden tools could successively be prepared according to the wood resources and the needs.

**A comparative study of some assemblages described as microlithic: Tata (Hungary), Kůlna (level II) (Czech Republic) and Taubach-Weimar (Germany)**

*The sites*

Site	entire pebbles	pebble tools	cores	flakes and fragments	% tools
Kůlna level II	8	35	150	10 362	6%
Tata	?	100	268	< 20 000	< 10%
Taubach-Weimar	?	3	48	784-1288	< 5%

Table II: The lithic assemblages from Kůlna, Tata and Taubach-Weimar

*Kůlna cave (level II)*

Kůlna cave is located in the Czech Republic, in the Moravian Karst. It was excavated by Karel Valoch from 1961 to 1976.<sup>31</sup> Several layers have been observed. In the upper part of the sequence, we can see four Micoquian levels (6a, 7a, 7b and 7c). Below these levels, the excavations show another Middle Palaeolithic level, number II, subdivided into sub-layers (IIa to IId).

The level II corresponds, in the state of knowledge, to the second half of the Eem Interglacial. The upper part of level II (a and b) and level 10 could be dated to a steppe period belonging to the end of the late Interglacial. The Micoquian layers could belong to the beginning of the last cold period (50 to 69 Ky), according to ESR dating.<sup>32</sup> The Kůlna Micoquian assemblages show numerous Rangifer bones while temperate species (forest and steppe forest environment) exist in level II (*Alces alces*, *Equus taubachensis*, *Cervus elaphus*, *Bos*, *Rhinoceros*).<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> LEMORINI 2000.; DOMINGUEZ-RODRIGO et al. 2001.

<sup>31</sup> VALOCH 1988.

<sup>32</sup> RINK et al. 1996.

<sup>33</sup> ZELINOVA 1998.